



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MV

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/518,525

12/22/2004

Hilde Azijn

TIP0016 US

6793

27777

7590

05/10/2006

PHILIP S. JOHNSON
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER

HUMPHREY, LOUISE WANG ZHIYING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1648

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/518,525	Applicant(s) AZIJN ET AL.	
	Examiner Louise Humphrey, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The Office acknowledges the receipt of Applicants' election and Amendment, filed on 29 March 2006.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants elect Group V, claims 5 and 6, with traverse. Applicants simply stated that "the request is traversed as excessive" without further argument or support. Because applicants did not distinctly and specifically point out any errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Applicants are no longer entitled to the rejoinder of the process claims with the product claims under *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* because Applicants have elected the process claims.

The restriction among the different products that may be used in the claimed methods is maintained.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 29 March 2006. Claims 5 and 6 are examined to the extent that they read on the elected species.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the title is included on the same page as the abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The title of the invention is objected to because it contains the word "new." The following title is suggested: Mutational Profiles in HIV-1 Protease Correlated with Phenotypic Drug Resistance. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second ¶

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: (1) determination of the viral drug

Art Unit: 1648

susceptibility; and (2) comparison of the drug susceptibility in samples containing the RT mutation, 386A, with samples containing wild type HIV reverse transcriptase.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first ¶

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for evaluating the effectiveness of a reverse transcriptase inhibitor for HIV strains with a mutation at position 386 to alanine in the reverse transcriptase region, does not reasonably provide enablement for determining the susceptibility or effectiveness of other HIV drugs and other viral drugs in viral strains containing drug-resistant mutations other than 386A. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

"[T]o be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation." *Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Wright* 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); See also *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1212, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Fisher* 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24

Art Unit: 1648

(CCPA 1970). Further, in *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed.

Cir. 1988) the court stated:

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized by the board in *Ex parte Forman* [230 USPQ 546, 547 (BdPatAppInt 1986)]. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The nature of the instant invention is a method for evaluating a change in viral drug susceptibility. The breadth of the instant claims is so broad that it encompasses all viral drugs.

The guidance provided in the specification is limited to the detection of drug-resistant mutations at position 386 in HIV reverse transcriptase. The specification does not provide the drug-resistance mutation profile for any viruses other than HIV. One skilled in the art cannot use the instant invention for other viral drugs because the mutation at position 386 is specific for HIV reverse transcriptase but not other HIV enzymes or other viruses.

Art Unit: 1648

The state of the art of HIV drug evaluation is uncertain. It is well known in the art that HIV is highly evolutionary and develops a wide spectrum of escape mutants (Shafer, 1999) towards not only reverse transcriptase inhibitors but also drugs acting at other different sites in an HIV particle, such as protease inhibitors and fusion inhibitors. Due to this unpredictable nature, one skilled in the art would not be able to assess the susceptibility for all HIV drugs using only the single point mutation provided in the instant claims and specification.

Considering the lack of data or working examples in the specification, the broad scope of the claims, the complex state and nature of the art, and the teachings regarding unpredictability in this art, one skilled in the art would have to engage in an undue amount of experimentation to practice the invention as claimed.

"Experimentation must not require ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art." See *Fields v. Conover*, 443 F.2d 1386, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1970). In the instant case, detection of 386A mutation is not considered routine in successful screening for viral drug resistance in the art and, without sufficient guidance, the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is undue or unreasonable under the circumstances. It is noted that the unpredictability of a particular area may alone provide reasonable doubt as to the accuracy of the broad statement made in support of enablement of claims. See *Ex parte Singh*, 17 USPQ2d 1714 (BPAI 1991).

The instant invention, based on the evidence as a whole, in light of the factors articulated by the court in *In re Wands*, lacks an enabling disclosure.

Art Unit: 1648

Remarks


Claims 5 and 6 are apparently free of prior art of the record. The closest prior art, Clevenbergh *et al.* (2002), teaches HIV reverse transcriptase (RT) mutations that have been associated with RT inhibitor resistance, but does not teach or fairly suggest the mutation 386A.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Louise Humphrey, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Louise Humphrey, Ph.D.
Assistant Patent Examiner
04 May 2006


JEFFREY STUCKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER